

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/085,791 02/28/2002		Peter Stouffer	111483.1060C1	8023		
22150	7590 04/01/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC			BEAULIEU	BEAULIEU, YONEL		
130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•		3661			
			DATE MAILED: 04/01/2003	DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
V		10/085,7	10/085,791 STOUFFER ET A		- •		
•	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit			
		Yonel Be	aulieu	3661			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
THE - External control	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no ev n. a reply within the stat eriod will apply and w statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tim utory minimum of thirty (30) days ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. & 133).	/. ommunication.		
Status							
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2 This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for allocation accordance with the practice und	This action is nowance except	on-final. for formal matters, pro		merits is		
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	ndrawn from co					
Applicati	on Papers						
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examement The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) the drawing(s) b rrection is require	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachmen	:(s)						
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	-152)		

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, "said interface unit" (line 3) lacks antecedent basis; are Applicants referring to the module established at line 2 or not? Also, "said alarm system" (line 4) lacks antecedent basis because such has not previously been identified.

Regarding claim 10, "said alarm system" (line 2) lacks antecedent basis because such has not previously been established.

Claims 2 - 9 and 11 - 20 are necessarily rejected as being dependent upon the rejection of claims 1 and 10 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/085,791 Page 3

Art Unit: 3661

Claims 1 - 7, 9 - 11, and 18 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Javors (US 6,028,533).

Regarding claims 1-7, 9-11, and 18-20, Javors teaches a vehicle control system and method of modifying functions of the system, comprising an interface module (40) connected to electronic input and output devices (33, 50, 51, 42, 44, 46 in fig. 2); a feature set module for detachably coupling to the interface module wherein the module contains programming for controlling different functions of an alarm system in progressive duration (col. 3: 34-38 at least); circuitry (18) for starting a vehicle (when switch 3 is pushed; see fig. 1; note also col. 1: 66-col. 2: 4), circuitry for activating a siren emanating from a horn (48; col. 2: 20-32 at least), circuitry (50) for activating motion (col. 2: 15-16; col. 3: 25-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 12 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Javors ('533) in view of Suman et al. (US 5,479,157).

As discussed above, Javors teaches all of the limitations except for the programming being downloaded over an Internet or using a cell phone or telematics or a wireless network.

However, Suman et al. teaches, in the same field of endeavor of vehicle control system, programming being downloaded over an Internet (formed by 13 and 19) or using a cell phone (75; see fig. 4) or telematics or a wireless network (see figs. 1, 6 and 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Javors' system by including programming being downloaded over the Internet or using a cell phone or telematics or a wireless network as evidenced by Suman et al in order to provide for efficiency and affordability of vehicular communication system.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA)

Art Unit: 3661

1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,719 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the Patent encompasses all of the limitations of the present claimed invention and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because the same end result of providing a variety of functions to a user of a vehicle using a programmable electronic device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yonel Beaulieu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R, from 0900-1600.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas BLACK can be reached on (703) 305-8233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Y. BEAULIEU March 16, 2005